



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,619	07/12/2007	James B. Ballard	60379-USA	2581

7590 01/31/2011
Patent Administrator
FMC Corporation
1735 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

LEVY, NEIL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/31/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/593,619	Applicant(s) BALLARD ET AL.	
	Examiner NEIL LEVY	Art Unit 1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/15/2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5 -, 10, 14 - 19 24- 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-9, 15-18 and 24-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 10, 14, 19, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 5 -, 10, 14 - 19 24- 29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/21/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 6-9, 15 -18 & 24-27 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/14/2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

ClaimS 5, 10, 14, & 28 ARE rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 20080319023A1.

The applied reference has a common ASSIGNEE with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

See [0008], household pests are controlled, thus, termites, even though they are not preferred. The ratio & concentrations of imidacloprid to bifenthrin are the instant. They are effective- see examples 1-7. No patentable weight is given to the intended use, nor is it given to termite control methods, because in the process of controlling various household pest, one would at least inadvertently hit the loci of termites.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 10,14, & 28 stand rejected as obvious over ASRAR et al 6660690.

Compositions, #77, of bifenthrin and imidacloprid are applied to the loci of termites, and to areas to be infested (col 23, lines 23-27) seeds (col 24, lines 9-19) at 0.005-25% of total weight of composition with seed. Ratio of actives is 1:1000 to 1000:1. These ranges are inclusive of the instant claim 5 ranges. As a suspension, actives are at least 0.5% (col 26, lines 22-28).

The compositions are shown to be synergistic constitute a limited number, and protect against termites, in addition to other insect pests; protection extends to seeds, roots, and trees (col 22, lines 11-14). The liquid compositions are applied to the locus where the termite is expected; seeds.

Claims are no longer rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AU22 12-9965409.

Claims 10, 19 & 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JAETSCH et al US 200100272 in view of ODA et al JP 2000141317.

JAETSCH provides methods to control termite infestation [0004] with application of liquid compositions [0038] of 5 % imidacloprid or 3 % bifenthrin [0078].

ODA also shows the two termite repellants.

The mixture of two actives to control termites is obvious , since both are effective termiticides.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to practice termite control, to modify the compositions available in order to increase toxicity by combining 2 active termiticide compounds.

It is well settled that when 2 or more compounds are each taught to be useful for the same purpose, here flea control is spot on formulations, it is obvious to combine them. In regards KERKHOVEN 626 F. 2nd 846, 850, 205, USPQ 1069.

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Double Patenting

Claims 5,10,14 & 28 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,6, 16,21,22, of copending Application No. 10/585426. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applications anticipate each other.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

Art Unit: 1615

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Applicant's arguments filed 11/15/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Arguments are that ASRAR is not for termites, & other references do not show the instant low levels. See rejections above; they are, they do, to the extent rejections are maintained.

The invention is to increase termite mortality at low application rates & to provide a chemical barrier to termites, but we do not see this as a result of the methods of control such as at claim 29. Claim 29 ought to also have the concentrations as recited in claim 28.

Then such a claim would be considered for allowability.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ROBERT A. WAX can be reached on 571-272-0623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1/28/2011

/NEIL LEVY/
ART UNIT 1615